The knower is never born nor dies, nor is it from anywhere, nor did it become anything.
—*Katha Upanishad*

THEOSOPHY

VOLUME 60 JUNE, 1972 NUMBER 8

MAN THE CREATOR

THE sweep of the present cycle brings into view many surface phenomena which seem fairly comprehensible, in view of what is said about this time of transition by Mr. Judge in *The Ocean of Theosophy,* and by H. P. Blavatsky in numerous places, yet the very characteristics of the age, which is a time of increased self-consciousness, generate so many theories and half-theories in modern thought, that a great deal of confusion must inevitably result. Men are questioning the meaning of their lives as they never have before, and the resources for finding adequate answers in the learning of this civilization are slim indeed. Hence the multiplication of new sects, the shallow borrowings from exotic faiths, and the rapid development of fashionable psychological jargon in which the decisive terms seem to change almost from week to week.

Yet some of the tendencies of the time are more stable than others. One theme that seems impossible to exhaust is the idea of the "creative" potentialities of human beings. It is as though this idea sounds a keynote of the cycle, and even if the term has been much vulgarized and cheapened by constant and careless use, it remains a fact that, a little more than a century ago, the application of the conception of creative capacity to human beings, as distinguished from the Deity of traditional religion, was regarded as blasphemous presumption. Yet as the principal of a New York high school suggests in a recent book, everyone is now regarded as having the capacity for creative action. As she put it: "Talent and artistry are rare. Creativity is not. We are all born with a potential

and capacity for creativity." This is now almost universally acknowledged, although the *meaning* of creativity remains obscure.

What does, in fact, lie back of the power of creativity in human beings? It seems clear enough that the power to originate comes from the mind, and we know that the mind is dual, which helps to explain the difference between the skillful copying and imitation which is so common and those works of authentic originality which embody some degree of higher vision.

But from a philosophical point of view, there are archetypal processes involved in the Theosophical explanation of cosmogony which may perhaps throw light on even the undertakings of men in their daily lives. In his *Notes on The Bhagavad-Gita* (p. 23), Mr. Judge gives in a few words an account of the great awakening of the Universe, in terms of the primordial Intelligence through which all that is finds form. He writes:

> . . . there must be a universal presiding spirit, the producer as well as the spectator, of all this collection of animate and inanimate things. The philosophy taught by Krishna, holds, that at first this spirit—so called, however, by me only for the purpose of the discussion—remained in a state of quiet with no objects, because as yet there was no modification. But, resolving to create, or rather to emanate the universe, IT formed a picture of what should be, and this at once was a modification willingly brought about in the hitherto wholly unmodified spirit; thereupon the Divine Idea was gradually expanded, coming forth into objectivity, while the essence of the presiding spirit remained unmodified, and became the perceiver of its own expanded idea. Its modifications are visible (and invisible) nature. Its essence then differentiates itself continually in various directions, becoming the immortal part of each man—the Krishna who talks to Arjuna. Coming like a spark from the central fire, it partakes of that nature, that is, the quality of being unmodifiable, and assumes to itself the human body and thus, being in essence unmodified, it has the capacity to perceive all the changes going on around the body.
>
> This *Self* must be recognized as being within, pondered over, and as much as possible understood, if we are to gain any true knowledge.

There is a direct analogy or correspondence between this primordial act of creation and the activity of the differentiated sparks of the spirit which are the source of self-awareness and creative potentiality in every human being. The very field of experience which lies before each one is an expression of his own expanded

idea, generated by him as cause, and realized through Karma. By thought men create, and this law applies at every level of his being, where the effects of prior thinking give shape to matter by appropriate means. Even in the case where physical tools are needed to carry out the instructions of the mind, there has first to be in the mind a picture of what should be, born of idea and desire, elaborated by the imagination, and then, transferred through the application of skills of various sorts to later intermediate stages of manifestation, in architect's plans and engineering calculations, before the various classes and groups of builders can be summoned to perform their tasks.

What was the idea? What was the desire? The original desire was for experience, for existence; it was the longing to *be,* to extend the radius of one's identity into matter and form not yet part of the ego's experience, which would be for the inner soul-intelligence a greater amplitude of self-awareness, a more complete identification with the immeasurable potentiality of the boundless ranges of universal Life. And so it is with each man who goes exploring, who breaks new ground, who opens up new territory, who builds a dwelling or founds a city. He acts for himself or for himself and others, seeking habitations and embodiments, fields and vehicles which promise enrichment of some sort. He may have a deep sense of the meaning of what he is doing, of what he seeks by these means, or he may not. The man of enlightened self-consciousness will make for himself forms and tools of action which do not grow into confining prisons because he creates without losing himself in the splendor of his finite creations. Such a being learns the meaning of acting for and as the Self.

As explained in *The Secret Doctrine* (II, 58-59), Brahmâ, the type of the creative principle throughout nature, generates the manifested universe through his will, creating first or bringing into being the order of intelligence which we describe as self-conscious beings, who are called *"the positive poles of creation."* The "secondary creation," which is of the manifested universe, comes about as Brahmâ "thinks of himself" as all that he calls into existence. The author of *The Secret Doctrine* says in a note: "This thinking of oneself as this, that, or the other, is the chief factor in the production of every kind of psychical or even physical phenomena."

And so it is with all of man's creations. A man who builds a house thinks of himself as living in that house, of making it a part

of himself. The work of the artist is a projection of an aspect of himself, incorporating some portion of the raw materials of the world in the construction he devises. Man is eternally building forms by this process of self-identification, a power which at root is *"Kriya-sakti*—the mysterious *Yoga* power," and behind all this is "the hope of attaining clear self-consciousness," which is the secret meaning of the familiar phrase declaring that Brahmâ is constantly "moved by the desire to create." (*S.D.* I, 106-7.) For this is the will to divinity, the only means to the highest state.

So far we have been speaking of that aspect of creation which is given graphic description by the expression, the "out-breathing" of the Universe. Also to be considered is the in-breathing process, called the return to the One. In this work of the soul—represented, we may say, by the meditation of the sage—there is a gathering of the harvest of experience and a refinement of the vehicles, with no longer the need to generate new fields, but now to achieve the consummation which the growth represents—a more inclusive and deepened sense of Self. The imagination now has other tasks—to see through the differentiations of form to the ground of common identity, to recognize the Self in all. There is act of creation in this work, too, but it belongs to the world within, where realization is realization not of form but of meaning, and where self-identification is with the great brotherhood of the whole of life.

WHOLENESS

Science was false by being unpoetical. It assumed to explain a reptile or mollusk, and isolated it—which is hunting for life in graveyards. Reptile or mollusk or man or angel only exist in system, in revelation. The metaphysician, the poet, only sees each animal form as an inevitable step in the path of the creating mind.

—RALPH WALDO EMERSON

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

From The Theosophical Forum

VI

How can we discern whether it is the divine conscience animating us and directing us in a certain direction, or the animal soul seeking release from seemingly unfavorable environment?

W.Q.J.—The divine conscience acts in all struggles for betterment, but clouded more or less in each by reason of education and habit of thought; hence it varies in brightness. It is not possible to make a hard-and-fast fixed rule for finding out what is the animating motive. If we are trying to get into a better state, it is for us to decide if that be simply and wholly selfish. All actions are surrounded by desire as the rust is round the polished metal or the smoke round the fire, but we must try. So if we fix for ourselves the rule that we will try to do the very best we can for others, we will generally be led right. If we rely on the higher self and aspire to be guided by it, we will be led to the right even if the road goes through pain, for sorrow and pain are necessary for purification of the soul. But if we wish to run away from an environment because we do not like it and without trying to live in it while not of it, we are not altering ourselves but simply altering the circumstances, and may not always thereby gain anything.

Is the seventh principle, the Atma, ever incarnated, or are our bodies simply projections of that principle and formed by it, as was the statue Galatea by Pygmalion? From some Theosophical books I gather that the seven principles are all incarnated from the beginning, and that each principle is evolved in turn. From others it would seem that the higher principles are never incarnated.

W.Q.J.—The fiction of the formation of Galatea by Pygmalion is such a faint and inadequate symbol or illustration that there is nothing to be gained by its use, as it will surely mislead. The evolution of the bodily form came about in the same way as that of all other forms; as said in *The Bhagavad-Gita,* "All is due to the mystic power of self-ideation, the eternal thought in the eternal mind," and only in the sense that all forms are projections from the eternal can we say that "our bodies are projections of that principle" (Atma). The second sentence of the question shows that here is another case

in which the very materialistic view of the sevenfold constitution of man given in *Esoteric Buddhism* and used by so many thereafter has resulted in inducing the notion that there is a separation between the so-called "principles." This idea of seven distinct things, entities, or principles in man ought to be abandoned, and is due almost wholly to erroneous nomenclature, as strongly urged in several papers published in the *Path*. There can only be *one* principle, and all the rest are but aspects of it, or *vehicles* for it to work and manifest through. Therefore but the one principle is involved in generation, when it takes to itself six sheaths or vehicles, or shows itself under six aspects. But as it is Theosophic doctrine that this *one* principle—call it Atma—is in essence the Supreme, then its involution in matter is but partial. In order to understand nature and to reach self-consciousness, it is necessary that the six vehicles be found to work through, and what is meant in some Theosophical books by the statement that each "principle evolves in turn" is that from the beginning of a Manvantara the six material vehicles have to be evolved one after the other in due order and in correspondence with the rest of nature, none lagging behind and none ahead. For instance, at that period in evolution when we might assume that but one vehicle had been fully evolved, then man (so-called) would not be man as we know him. So we see in *The Secret Doctrine* that man, strictly as such, is not spoken of until several races or vehicles had been first fully evolved in due order and proportion.

From these considerations the old Hindu idea that what we see of man is but the inner (or outer) hard core—the material body—and that he, in fact, in his whole nature reaches even to the moon, would seem to gain some support. And I should incline to the opinion that Atma is never incarnated, but overshadows and shines into the being called man whom it has chosen to connect itself with.

According to Theosophical teaching, intuition is the sixth sense of man. Can it be cultivated, and, if so, how? If it is a sense like hearing, seeing, and smelling, why cannot it be trained as they are?

W.Q.J.—I do not know that it is "according to theosophical teaching that intuition is the sixth sense." It would be well to have a citation of chapter or article where this statement is made. The question of the sixth sense is speculative as yet, nothing being decided. Like the fourth dimension, it is involved in doubt. Hence it should not be assumed that the assertion in the question is correct. Many persons hold that intuition is not the sixth sense, because it may very

well be that a species of very rapid reasoning enters into intuitional acts, making them so rapid in conclusion as to appear devoid of reasoning as a means to find the conclusion arrived at. For myself I do not believe that intuition is the sixth sense nor any sense at all. But whatever intuition is, it can only be cultivated by having the right mental poise, the right philosophy and the right ethics; and by giving the intuition scope, or chance, so that by many mistakes we at last arrive at a knowledge of how to use it.

What is precisely meant by Soul in Theosophical literature? We say the "Soul of man," the "Soul of the world," the "Soul of things."
W.Q.J.—Theosophical literature has not as yet come to a *precise* meaning for "soul," nor can it until the English language has been so altered as to remove the confusion now existing among such terms as "soul" and "spirit," and in the uses to which both are put. So long as we have in fact but two terms, *soul* and *spirit,* to designate so many beings, kinds of beings and powers as those are used for, just so long will there be confusion.

Are Plane and Principle ever interchangeable terms? Can a Principle be said to be a Plane of the working of the next higher Plane, i.e. as Buddhi is the vehicle of Atma, or the ethereal double necessary as the bridge for Prana to cross over to the physical body? May they be said to be analogous to Spirit and Matter, opposite poles of the same thing?
W.Q.J.—It does not seem to be right to try to interchange these two words, for it will result in mixing up the ideas. A plane is, like a plane surface, quite different from a principle, just as gas is different from the place in which it may exist and be felt. Plane of consciousness is used to designate the stage or metaphysical place the consciousness has reached or may be on or in. But to say that a principle of this plane is a plane for some higher state is very mixed, for it would result that thereby our individuality would be lost and all be reduced to annihilation. Whereas as each individual retains his identity and thus must preserve the identity of his principles, whatever those are, it must follow that his principles are not planes but remain as before principles. However, it must be remembered that the word "principle" is used loosely, and sometimes that which is not such is so called. It is easy and definite to retain the actual meaning of "plane" and not try to mix it with some other word. I cannot see any analogy between these two words and "spirit and matter," inasmuch as *plane* means a place for operation or use and *principle* is that which uses or operates on a plane.

THEOSOPHY AND "EVOLUTION"

FOR most people today, the idea of Evolution, as applied to both man and nature, is associated with Darwin. Since man, in this view, belongs to the animal kingdom, there is little foundation for moral values in human life, so far as its origins are concerned. Expressions such as "blind forces of nature" and "the struggle for existence," which can be traced to the Darwinists, have taken on for many the strength of moral imperatives, and are partly responsible for the sad aimlessness of general existence and acceptance of aggressive competition between man and man, nation and nation, as the "law of nature."

Except among scholars, it is not widely realized that, since Darwin, various discoveries and theories in science have had the effect of calling some of his basic conceptions into question. The hopeful aspect of these changes in outlook lies in the fact that in some instances scientific ideas are becoming much more hospitable to the Theosophical teachings.

Before considering a few of these changes, a general view of the Theosophic teaching on Evolution should prove helpful. Initially, it should be noted that the chief difference between Theosophy and Science lies in the teaching of the former that the primary causes of evolution are to be discerned only on metaphysical planes; the physical plane is the plane of effects.

In Theosophy, nothing can be taken for granted. The power which animates both nature and man; the origin of the human mind; the place and function of the kingdoms of nature in relation to these factors—all require investigation.

Theosophy teaches that there are three streams of Evolution—(1) the Monadic stream, containing the animating impulse, is the representative and witness of the ever-mysterious power of the Logos which periodically radiates from the depths of Absoluteness. This is the power which vivifies and sustains all forms of life, being present in and affecting both the second and the third streams of evolution.

The external evolution of the kingdoms of nature constitutes the third stream, while the second is the expression of the conscious in-

telligence in nature and the mind of man. Only when all three are joined do we have a complete human being.

The vital and fundamental relationship between Man and Nature assures the continuing progress of Evolution. This may be illustrated by a familiar analogy. Everyone knows that the construction of an automobile is a complicated undertaking. First someone designs a particular model. Exact specifications are laid down for the hundreds of parts that are to perform special functions in the completed vehicle. Many separate manufacturers exist for the purpose of making and supplying these parts. Then, when they are finally produced, each according to its specific requirement, and all in conformity with the over-all design, they are sent to a central location where they are assembled and fitted into place, thus completing the fabrication of the car. But this elaborate process does not achieve its designed goal until a man sits behind the wheel and drives the car away.

By analogy, the "parts" are the "lives" in the kingdoms of Nature, undergoing experience and "training," so that they will function efficiently in the body of man—his vehicle. And it is only when Man, the Self-Conscious Thinker, incarnates into this body —designed and made ready for him—that the vehicle can fulfill its purpose. This incarnation of the second stream, it is said, began 18,000,000 years ago.

When Man as a mind-intelligence appeared upon the scene, the active fulfillment of the over-all evolutionary plan could begin. For without Man, evolution could not go on, but through his awakened and now embodied mind, a twofold purpose is accomplished. First, the life of the lower kingdoms receives an impetus, a helping hand toward higher levels of expression. Second, the self-conscious individual man enters upon a series of reincarnations which has for its goal an expansion and development of his potentialities, intellectual and spiritual, which may lead to Mahatmaship, the highest reach of human development.

And now, turning to the changes in scientific theory, we might first recall that Darwin, wishing to explain the consolidation by a species of its gains or developments, resorted to the doctrine of the inheritance of acquired characteristics—a view later rendered obsolete by August Weissmann's "continuity of the germ plasm." A specialist in embryological research, Weissmann declared that the germ cells constituted a separate caste within the body. They

did not collaborate with the somatic (body) cells, as Darwin had proposed; their sole function was procreation. Whatever the learning or development or progress of the organism as a whole—the "acquired characteristics"—none of these could be "communicated" to the germ cells for the purpose of hereditary transmission.

As a result of scientific attention to the germ cells, first the chromosomes and then the genes were discovered, leading to another theory. The germ cell was now held to be the sole source of types or species and their traits. How did they change? "Mutation" in the germ cells. Whatever the merits of this theory—and it seems to dominate today—it certainly weakened the case for Darwin's Natural Selection, for the cause of evolution is considered to be within the body, not in the outside environment. Mutations, however, remain a mystery. Even cosmic rays have been suggested as their possible cause, since it is known that exposure to X-rays may produce variations in genetic effects, usually undesirable variations.

But while geneticists try to cope with the inadequacies of gene theory, embryologists have been making further discoveries. Some kind of an overriding, pre-existing, formative intelligence, they find, supervises the growth of cells. Burr and Northrop called it the Electrical Architect. Other names given this morphogenetic principle are "Entelechy" and "organizer." E. W. Sinnott has written in his *Bridge of Life*: "How genes control development is quite unknown. . . . A living thing is not a collection of parts and traits but an *organized system* well called an *organism.*" To many, this idea seems eminently sensible. But it has a cardinal "defect" for some scientists: this "living thing" does not submit to mechanistic analysis.

The one notion that underlies all of the changes so far noted is that physical matter represents the one reality, and that whatever differences may arise must all be explained in terms of that matter. This is usually applied, also, to the mystery of mind. For a long time, physiological science has maintained that mind is only a name for brain activity, both being dependent on causes arising in the environment. And so we have the various schools of Behaviorism, involving "the conditioned reflex," etc. But these are now in danger of being eclipsed by the tide of the new Humanistic psychology, which has largely freed itself from mechanistic assumptions.

For evidence of the great change in outlook among at least some

scientists, there is the following from George Gaylord Simpson's *The Meaning of Evolution*:

> Man is an entirely new kind of animal. . . . His place in nature and its supreme significance to man are not defined by his animality but by his humanity . . . a fundamentally *new sort* of evolution has appeared. The basis of this new sort of evolution is a *new sort* of *heredity*, the inheritance of learning . . . of acquired characters, of knowledge and learned activities. . . . In the new evolution new factors arise as elements in consciousness . . . [which are] not mechanistically determinate . . . but subjected to . . . complex interplay of emotions, value judgments, and moral and ethical decisions . . . purpose and plan are characteristic in the new evolution because man has purposes and makes plans . . . [thus] the new evolution becomes subject to conscious control.

Substitute for the claim that mind "emerged" *from* the body the idea of its incarnation, followed by a long series of *re*incarnations, and one has a partial repetition of the teaching of the second stream of evolution taught in Theosophy. Two other Theosophical conceptions are embraced in the changes in scientific theory. One is embodied in a statement by H. P. Blavatsky: "The Darwinian theory . . . of the transmission of acquired faculties, is neither taught nor accepted in Occultism." (*S.D.* I, 219.) For the other, we may note that the invisible principle which directs the cells in a growing embryo closely approaches certain of the functions of the astral body.

The Three Streams of Evolution, meeting and mingling in Man, give a comprehensive account of the purpose and process in nature, and a clue to Man's divine destiny. While the first stream is omnipresent in both Nature and Man, it is only by becoming *aware* of its presence and merging himself in it, that Man achieves conscious immortality and becomes a co-worker in the Divine Plan.

Everyday Paradoxes

Many who have not learnt to argue rationally still live according to reason.

Many who commit the basest actions often exercise the best discourse.

Fools frequently become wise under the pressure of misfortunes.

It is necessary to emulate the works and actions and not the words of Virtue.

—*Lucifer*

letters • questions • comment

If the whole universe is simply an illusion, how is it possible to learn from experience?

The question needs restatement. In the first place, the universe is not "simply an illusion," but the field of experience for intelligent beings. The word "illusion" has a quite shallow meaning which seems to be its usage here. To say something is illusory suggests that it does not exist, that there is no reality present, that the appearance is some sort of "trick." This is hardly the meaning intended by the philosophical idea of "Maya," which proposes that the great panoply of existence which lies before us will some day be withdrawn, and that the intelligence which gave it birth will also withdraw to a state of primeval unity from which, after an immensity of years, it will emerge again for another great cycle of evolution. The creative and emanative activity which brings the universe into being is caused, at root, by the longing to know, to enrich, to realize, to experience wider expanses of the diversity of life. Metaphysically, if the One Changeless Reality is alone that which remains unaltered and unaffected by anything that may come to pass, then that Reality is alone without illusion; yet the fields of experience, through which we pass, and which depend upon ideation for their existence, are profoundly real as the means of learning the lessons of life.

It is important, then, to note how H. P. Blavatsky uses the word illusion in relation to the universe. Does she really say that the whole universe is simply an illusion? Reference to source material will quickly show. For example, one passage in *The Secret Doctrine,* italicized for comment, is worth careful reading on this point:

> (4) The Universe is *called,* with everything in it, MAYA, because all is temporal therein, from the ephemeral life of a firefly to that of the Sun. Compared to the eternal *immutability of the One, and* the changelessness of *that* Principle, the Universe, with its evanescent ever-changing forms, must be necessarily *in the mind* of a philosopher, no better than a will-o'-the-wisp. Yet the Universe is *real enough to the conscious beings in it,* which are as unreal as it is itself. (*S.D.* I, 274.)

Notice that H.P.B. does not say that the universe *is* Maya, but

that it is *called* Maya, because it is in "time" and not in eternity (Duration). It is only *in comparison* with the ultimate Reality that the universe can be called an illusion. Further, it is in the *mind* of the philosopher, *while he is philosophizing*, that he envisions the universe as "illusion."

Again, citing *The Secret Doctrine*:

> Whatever plane our consciousness may be acting in, both we and the things belonging to that plane are, for the time being, our only realities. As we rise in the scale of development we perceive that during the stages through which we have passed we mistook shadows for realities, and the upward progress of the Ego is a series of progressive awakenings, each advance bringing with it the idea that now, at last, we have reached "reality"; but only when we shall have reached the absolute Consciousness, and blended our own with it, shall we be free from the delusions produced by Maya. (I, 40.)

In the first passage, H.P.B. leads "down" from the universe as an illusion to the "reality" of our plane; in the second, "up" from *our* consciousness to the absolute consciousness. In both passages, however, she supplies the links that keep us in pace with the flow of her thought.

The Producer of Illusion

We have to first understand what man is, his real nature, what the cause of his present condition, before we can arrive at any pure and true concentration, before we can use the higher mind and the powers that flow from it. For the powers that we use in the body are *transmitted* powers, drawn, indeed, from our inner spiritual nature, but so disturbed and limited that they are not powerful. We need to know about our minds, and we need to *control* our minds—that is, the lower mind, occupied with personal and physical things, known in Theosophical phraseology, as Lower *Manas*. It is this "internal organ," the thinking principle, which the ancients said is the great producer of illusion—the great distracter of concentration. For there is no possibility of obtaining real concentration until the possessor of the mind can place it where he will, and for as long a time as he pleases.

—Robert Crosbie

SANSKRIT PRONUNCIATIONS

The following are hints of how to pronounce some Sanskrit words found in theosophical literature—

Word	Meaning	Pronunciation
ARJUNA	The shining one	Arjoonah
ASURA	The evil spirits	Asoorah
ATMA	Soul	Atmah
AVIDYA	Ignorance	Ahvidya
AVITCHI	Hell	Ahvitchee
BHAGAVAD-GITA	Song of God	Benáhrays
BENARES	The sacred city	Bähgaväd-Geetah
BRAHMA	Creator	Brähmah
BUDDHA	Enlightened One	Boodhah
BUDDHI	Highest intelligence	Boodhee
CHELA	Disciple	Chaylah
DEVACHAN	Heaven	Dayva-khan
GURU	Teacher	Gooroo
KAMA	Desire	Kahmah
KALI	Death, Dark, Wife	Kahlee
KRISHNA	A divine incarnation	Kreeshnah
LOKA	Place or plane	Lõkah
MANAS	Mind	Mahnas
MANVANTARA	The life of a Manu	Mänvántãrã
SIVA	The destroyer	Seevah
SURYA	The sun	Sooreea
VEDA	The revealed books of religion	Vaydah
VISHNU	The Preserver	Vishnoo
YUGA	An age or term of years	Yoogah
YOGA	Concentration	Yohgah

NOTE.—This article was first printed in the *Path* for October, 1889. The note following the reference to page 95 in the *Path* was printed in June, 1886.

These will give a good idea of how, in general, all these Sanscrit terms are to be sounded; the a as ah, o as oh, u as oo, e as eh, i as ee, almost without exception. The error should never be made of pronouncing Manas, *Maynas*, nor Kali as *Kaylai*.

On p. 95 of Vol. I of *Path* will be found further suggestions.

DEAR BROTHER:—Is there any dictionary or book giving the correct pronunciation of the Oriental words so current in theosophical literature?

Yours _____

[In Sanskrit dictionaries the true pronunciation is found. But if our correspondent will, in these words, always read *a* as *ah*, *e* as *eh*, *i* as *ee*, *u* as *oo*, and *o* as *oh*, she will be right. *Arjuna* is sounded as *Arjoona*, *Veda* as *Vaydah*, *Brahma* as *Brähmä*, *Prakriti* as *Präkreetee*, *Mulaprakriti* as *Moolahprakreetee*, and so on.—E.]

THE LANGUAGE OF SOUL

Latin, and even Greek, perfected and finished as they are, and therefore models for our imitation and emulation in the perfecting of our use of our own tongue, are but pale shadows of the noble Sanskrit, the perfection of language of the past Race, embodying in it all former perfections since the beginning of speech upon this earth. For Sanskrit, in the days when it was a living tongue, was also the living vehicle of thought. Its sounds, the *active* phase of language, were so entirely the vehicle of meaning, that they conveyed their own definition, and immediately induced in the mind of the listener the exact modification—that is, the *exact state of being*—of the speaker. Misunderstanding of one by another, so universally common and unavoidable in our times, was then unknown, for language was the *living antaskarana* of thought or ideation. The listener not only heard sounds and words: he heard, he saw, he felt, what was taking place in the mind of the speaker, *as if it were himself*.

That day will come again, and Sanskrit once more become the language of men, as it has been and is, the language of the Gods—or perfected men. To hasten the advent of that day, with all that it implies, was the reason for the coming of H. P. Blavatsky among men, for her writing, teaching, working as she did, and for interjection into the language of Theosophy of so many Sanskrit terms and ideas.

—ROBERT CROSBIE

MASTERS, ADEPTS, TEACHERS, AND DISCIPLES

THIS article is meant for members of the T.S., and chiefly for those who keep H.P.B. much in mind, whether out of respect and love or from fear and envy. Those members who believe that such beings as the Masters may exist must come to one of two conclusions in regard to H.P.B.: either that she invented her Masters, who therefore have no real existence, or that she did not invent them but spoke in the names and by the orders of such beings. If we say she invented the Mahatmas, then, of course, as so often was said by her, all that she has taught and written is the product of her own brain, from which we would be bound to conclude that her position on the roll of great and powerful persons must be higher than people have been willing to place her. But I take it most of us believe in the truth of her statement that she had those teachers whom she called Masters and that they are more perfect beings than ordinary men.

The case I wish to briefly deal with then, is this: H.P.B. and her relations to the Masters and to us; her books and teachings; the general question of disciples or chelas with their grades, and whether a high chela would appear as almost a Master in comparison to us, including every member from the President down to the most recent applicant.

The last point in the inquiry is extremely important, and has been much overlooked by members in my observation, which has extended over the larger part of the T.S. An idea has become quite general that chelas and disciples are all of one grade, and that therefore one chela is the same as another in knowledge and wisdom. The contrary, however, is the case. Chelas and disciples are of many grades, and some of the Adepts are themselves the chelas of higher Adepts. There is therefore the greatest difference between the classes of chelas, since among them has to be counted the very humblest and most ignorant person who has devoted himself or herself to the service of mankind and the pursuit of the knowledge of the Self. On the other hand, there are those chelas, high in grade,

---

NOTE.—This article was first published in the *Path*, June, 1893.

actual pupils of the Masters themselves, and these latter have so much knowledge and power as to seem to us to be Adepts. Indeed, they are such when one compares them with oneself as a mere product of the nineteenth century. They have gained through knowledge and discipline those powers over mind, matter, space, and time which to us are the glittering prizes of the future. But yet these persons are not the Masters spoken of by H.P.B. So much being laid down, we may next ask how we are to look at H.P.B.

In the first place, everyone has the right to place her if he pleases for himself on the highest plane, because he may not be able to formulate the qualities and nature of those who are higher than she was. But taking her own sayings, she was a chela or disciple of the Masters, and therefore stood in relation to them as one who might be chided or corrected or reproved. She called them her Masters, and asseverated a devotion to their behests and a respect and confidence in and for their utterances which the chela has always for one who is high enough to be his Master. But looking at her powers exhibited to the world, and as to which one of her Masters wrote that they had puzzled and astonished the brightest minds of the age, we see that compared with ourselves she was an Adept. In private as in public she spoke of her Masters much in the same way as did Subba Row to the writer when he declared in 1884, "The Mahatmas are in fact some of the great Rishees and Sages of the past, and people have been too much in the habit of lowering them to the petty standard of this age." But with this reverence for her teachers she had for them at the same time a love and friendship not often found on earth. All this indicates her chelaship to Them, but in no way lowers her to us or warrants us in deciding that we are right in a hurried or modern judgment of her.

Now some Theosophists ask if there are other letters extant from her Masters in which she is called to account, is called their chela, and is chided now and then, besides those published. Perhaps yes. And what of it? Let them be published by all means, and let us have the full and complete record of all letters sent during her life; those put forward as dated after her death will count for naught in respect to any judgment passed on her, since the Masters do not indulge in any criticisms on the disciples who have gone from earth. As she has herself published letters and parts of letters from the Masters to her in which she is called a chela and is chided, it certainly cannot matter if we know of others of the same sort. For

over against all such we have common sense, and also the declarations of her Masters that she was the sole instrument possible for the work to be done, that They sent her to do it, and that They approved in general all she did. And she was the first direct channel to and from the Lodge, and the only one up to date through which came the objective presence of the Adepts. We cannot ignore the messenger, take the message, and laugh at or give scorn to the one who brought it to us. There is nothing new in the idea that letters are still unpublished wherein the Masters put her below them, and there is no cause for any apprehension. But it certainly is true that not a single such letter has anything in it putting her below us; she must ever remain the greatest of the chelas.

There only remains, then, the position taken by some and without a knowledge of the rules governing these matters, that chelas sometimes write messages claimed to be from the Masters when they are not. This is an artificial position not supportable by law or rule. It is due to ignorance of what is and is not chelaship, and also to confusion between grades in discipleship. It has been used as to H.P.B. The false conclusion has first been made that an accepted chela of high grade may become accustomed to dictation given by the Master and then may fall into the false pretense of giving something from himself and pretending it is from the Master. It is impossible. The bond in her case was not of such a character to be dealt with thus. One instance of it would destroy the possibility of any more communication from the teacher. It may be quite true that probationers now and then have imagined themselves as ordered to say so and so, but that is not the case of an accepted and high chela who is irrevocably pledged, nor anything like it. This idea, then, ought to be abandoned; it is absurd, contrary to law, to rule, and to what must be the case when such relations are established as existed between H.P.B. and her Masters.

—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

What man actually needs is not a tension-less state but rather the striving and struggling from some goal worthy of him. What he needs is not the discharge of tension at any cost, but the call of a potential meaning waiting to be fulfilled by him.

—VIKTOR E. FRANKL

STUDY OR SEARCH?

FROM *Adelphi*: A most perplexed individual is writing to you. I have been for three years endeavoring to study Theosophy. I have heard lectures, have read an immense amount of literature devoted to that cult, from the sages of old down to the Sinnetts, Olcotts, and Blavatskys of the present day. I have conned the Yoga Philosophy and I read the *Path*. *Light on the Path* aids me not, nor does *Bhagavad-Gita*, and why? Because I am yet without the first steps toward practice. (Surely Theosophy—like other sciences—must have *something* practical about it?) Guide me with your friendly hints. Imagine me alone in a room. How to commence? Show me the first step upon the practical ladder! All I have heard and read seemeth to me so elaborately unintelligible that I lay it aside and beg you to instruct me in my Theosophical A B C. Astral Light! Is it a figurative light, *i.e.*, Revelation? or is it a light, as electricity—the Heavens—coal—gives light? If abstraction (into insensibility) is necessary, can you instruct me upon Hypnotism (self mesmerism)? "A shining object" is advised to stare at! A mirror is a shining object, for instance. But of what avail to stare at a mirror and see reflected ugliness!

Answer—You say that for three years you have been endeavoring to *study* Theosophy. Such being the case, you will meet with but little success. Divine Wisdom can not be a subject for *study*, but it may be an object of *search*. With the love for this same wisdom uppermost in our hearts, we ask you if it would not be wiser to lay aside the *study* of so called Theosophy and study yourself. Knowing yourself you know all men, the worlds seen and occult, and find Theo-Sophia. One cannot absorb Theosophy as a sponge does water, to be expelled at the slightest touch. Our conception of Theosophy is apt to be based upon the idea that it is an especial line of teaching—a larger, wider, and greater doctrine than others perhaps, but still a doctrine, and therefore limited. We must bear in mind that the true Theosophist belongs to no cult or sect, yet belongs to each and all; that he can find the true object of his search

---

NOTE.—This is a portion of an article first printed by Wm. Q. Judge, as "Answers to Questioners," in the *Path*, February, 1888, and last appeared in THEOSOPHY for January, 1954. The title used above is our own.

equally as well in the Hebrew bible as in the Yoga philosophy, in the New Testament equally as well as in *The Bhagavad-Gita.*

You say you have "conned the Yoga philosophy." This is not enough; merely to "con" it is not to know it. It is in fact a most practical system (if you refer to that of Patanjali), and one that will meet all requirements you have in the way of difficulty; for it is one of the most difficult. It is not possible for you to judge its merits without practice: and it gives full directions. If for three years you study and practice it—aye for one year—, you will find that you need no other. In these matters there is no child's play nor the usual English and American method of mere book-learning,—we must absorb and work into the practice and the theory laid down, for they are not written merely for the *intellect,* but for the whole spiritual nature. There must be within the man something which he already knows, that leaps up and out when he scans the books of wisdom; a thing already existing, which only takes an added life or confirmation from books. True Theosophy has all that is practical, but many forget this; there is no greater system of practice than that required by it.

Desire wisdom; love all men; do your duty; forget yourself; let each thought and act of your life have for its aim the finding of divine wisdom; strive to apply that wisdom for the good of other men. If you search in every direction, Light must come to you. Let the place in which you now are be the lonely room you speak of, and seek to find in everything the meaning. Strive to know what they are, and by what governed or caused. This is the first step. Live your life with this ever before you. Purify your thought as well as your body. Reason all you can, feel all with your heart you may, and when intellect and heart fail you, seek for something higher. This is the A. B. C.; it is enough for the present.

It is not Theosophy that is a science, but its application. It is not a "cult," for it covers and includes all.

The Astral Light is an actuality. It is not revelation, but a means through which that which causes revelation acts. Electricity, the heavens, all lower fires, are but the shadows of the Astral Light, just as the Astral Light is but the darkness of the Ineffable Light.

Abstraction into insensibility is not intended. If it had been so intended it would be unnecessary for us to be in these bodies. If you can forget yourself sufficiently—forget that you exist as a human body, you will not need to stare at a mirror; but so long as you

realize, when staring into a glass, whether you be pretty or ugly, you can not reach Celestial sensibility or terrestrial insensibility.

Hypnotism is the controlling of other personalities. Under this you would be but a puppet for the thought of another. Your outer self had better become a puppet for your own thought.

We seek to make the body alive, not to kill it.

ZADOK

THE SENSE OF SEPARATENESS

In reality these fires [the Hierarchies of "Sons of the Fire"] are not separate, any more than are the souls or monads to him who seeks beyond the veil of matter or illusion.

He who would be an occultist must not separate either himself or anything else from the rest of creation or *non-creation*. For, the moment he distinguishes himself from even a vessel of dishonour, he will not be able to join himself to any vessel of honour. He must think of himself as an infinitesimal something, not even as an individual atom, but as a part of the world-atoms as a whole, or become an illusion, a nobody, and vanish like a breath leaving no trace behind. As illusions, we are separate distinct bodies, living in masks furnished by Maya. Can we claim one single atom in our body as distinctly our own? Everything, from spirit to the tiniest particle, is part of the whole, at best a link. Break a single link and all passes into annihilation; but this is impossible. There is a series of vehicles becoming more and more gross, from spirit to the densest matter, so that with each step downward and outward we get more and more the sense of separateness developed in us. Yet this is illusory, for if there were a real and complete separation between any two human beings, they could not communicate with, or understand each other in any way.

—H. P. BLAVATSKY

on the lookout

Monotony of Attacks

Reviewing R. D. Laing's *The Politics of the Family* (*New York Times Book Review,* Oct. 3, 1971), Richard Sennett asks why Laing's indictments of the family structures and related institutions, though accurate enough, tend to become tiresome. He wonders if Laing gives expression to ideas that have grown commonplace through repetition. He says:

> In the dullness of his attacks on an inhumane society, Laing is, of course, not alone. Many of those who took fire during the recent years of turbulence are now passing through a moment when a great number of painfully acquired ideas threaten to enter the comfortable landscape of cliché. I don't mean that radical rhetoric is out of date, because the fissures in society stimulating it are still there; I mean rather that something is atrophying in the words and ideas to express anger, so that the rhetoric remains true but no longer truly angers. Why this should be so, Laing's new book, in its very weariness, helps make clear.

Evasion of Issues?

Examining Laing's approach, Mr. Sennett says that the British psychiatrist takes the position as a therapist that mental illness is all too often the response to the irrational demands of society: when a person is pulled in opposite directions, his attempts to resolve the conflict, even though logical from an internal standpoint, may be irrational to observers. Laing, therefore, blames society for the resulting disorders, siding with the victim. Mr. Sennett continues:

> This tendency to cling to the victim as hero took hold of Laing in two ways. Everything he saw in his consulting room, all his intellectual associations and allies, made him think that traditional psychiatric logic, positing "rational" standards of behavior, was a sham, was really a tool for keeping dissidence down. If Laing were to become a social critic, if he began to ask why society brought into being these human traumas, wouldn't his gifts of sensitivity and originality fall prey to the deadness of that sane world? There is a failure of nerve here,

a fear of putting himself in enemy territory, but it is complex and humane because it is a fear of losing his own humanity.

Effects of Isolation

Mr. Sennett observes however that, in siding with the suffering of his patients in this way, Laing has, in effect, abandoned the rest of society and cut himself off from the search for the more pervasive causes of all mental illness. In other words, this is not a philosophical position that is equal to the demands of such a calling. As Mr. Sennett remarks:

> This invasion from the outer world, Laing says, is blind, unintentional: each person or social group wounds others only hoping to protect itself. I believe this, but I don't understand why. Laing believes it, and doesn't think it matters why, because "why" gets us too far away from the "reality that is the patient."

Villains Must Be Understood

Mr. Sennett sees this state of mind as similar to that which many sympathetic people fall into when they contemplate the injustices which press on every side and seem beyond correction because of their enormous complexity. In the face of such problems the little any one individual can do seems so ineffectual that sympathy flags and, sooner or later, may be replaced by apathy or bitterness. But Mr. Sennett remains critical of this despair:

> What has gone sour in Laing is not unique to him, but is representative for the deadening of sentiment in the last few years that has seized us, his contemporaries. His refusal to think about the enemy mirrors our own: white racism, genocide, monopoly capitalism—these are the villains and what more do we need to know about them but that they must be destroyed?
>
> In truth, the resistance each man can mount to repression has to be renewed in his life, not by repeated declarations of will, but by continual doubts about what and why he is fighting. "A revolutionary is motivated by great feelings of love," said Che, but he is also moved by curiosity; I think a man is liberated not by becoming completely absorbed in the fact that he is oppressed, but in exercising his power to understand with a certain grim disinterest the forces impinging on him. Political sensitivity thrives on uncertainty because the possibility to be moved, to revolt, and be moved again, comes only from a deep distrust that at last one has settled what is wrong.

Flight from What We Are

Sennett continues:

> Intellect keeps uncertainty alive, and the failure to use it

closes one up in the room where Laing is imprisoned. White, middle-class persons who have come to sense what blackness means to an American black, or warfare to a Vietnamese, now speak of "identifying" with these struggles. Few of us in Laing's generation speak of identifying with the middle class, because we don't like it, and we think we can make change only by orienting our sensibilities around persons or conditions ineradicably different from ourselves. When Laing crossed that barrier and began to live through others, he went dead inside, could not speak of himself as probingly as he could speak for his patients, lost the power to create anger at the world which held them both so harshly in its grip. I wish I knew where it would lead to think out the realities of our lives as persons who are not dramatically suffering, but I do know that until we stop this presumptuous sentimentality, until uncertainty and curiosity about who we are ourselves return, we will become increasingly bored with our own "causes" and tolerant of the society that brings them into being.

Requirements of Change

The obstacles to the creation of a more humane society which Dr. Laing finds so formidable, partly because people are unconscious of the changes that must take place in themselves first, are described by a *Manas* writer (Oct. 6, 1971) in these terms:

It is difficult to "do" anything about the natural or "normal" resistance to change in human nature. The only quick way to overcome it is by inspiring sudden fear to produce emotional polarization, and the conservative reaction which sets in immediately after the change is as bad or worse than the earlier resistance. To overcome this resistance to change by constructive means, men need to develop disciplined powers of imagination and some daring, and only those with heroic potentialities are likely to learn these things during vast social disturbances.

What else can we do? This is not really a difficult question to answer. We need to give renewed attention to first principles and our theory of knowledge. Initially, the attention should be critical.

First, then, we can say this: What we know about the world and how it works does not touch human beings nor make any significant reference to the distinctive realities of man's life.

A Place to Stand

The crucial point of Richard Sennett's criticism is that there continues to be the need for a place to stand, an "intellectual habitation," which will afford a means for compassionate identification

with the victims of oppression while at the same time providing the basis for exercising the "power to understand with a certain grim disinterest the forces impinging" on all of us. Such a basis is the perspective afforded by the philosophy of Theosophy, admirably illustrated by a passage in H. P. Blavatsky's article "The Fall of Ideals":

> Hitherto, it was remarked in almost every historical age that a wide interval, almost a chasm, lay between practical and ideal perfection. Yet, as from time to time certain great characters appeared on earth who taught mankind to look beyond the veil of illusion, man learnt that the gulf was not an impassable one; that it is the province of mankind through its higher and more spiritual races to fill the great gap more and more with every coming cycle; for every man, as a unit, has it in his power to add his mite toward filling it.

Hidden Realities

> Yes; there are still men, who, notwithstanding the present chaotic condition of the moral world, and the sorry *débris* of the best human ideals, still persist in believing and teaching that the now *ideal* human perfection is no dream, but a law of divine nature; and that, had Mankind to wait even millions of years, still it must some day reach it and rebecome *a race of gods*.
>
> Meanwhile, the periodical rise and fall of human character on the external planes takes place now, as it did before, and the ordinary average perception of man is too weak to see that both processes occur each time on a higher plane than the preceding. But as such changes are not always the work of centuries, for often extreme changes are wrought by swift acting forces—*e.g.* by wars, speculations, epidemics, the devastation of famines or religious fanaticism—therefore, do the blind masses imagine that man was, is, and will be the same. To the eyes of us, moles, mankind is like our globe—seemingly stationary. And yet, both move in space and time with an equal velocity, around themselves and—*onward*.

Book on Pyramids

A new and very impressive study of the Great Pyramid of Egypt has made an appearance—*The Secrets of the Great Pyramid,* by Peter Tompkins. The book is a massive compendium of information about the pyramid: the attempts to explore, measure, explain, and understand it. Abounding in photographs and diagrams, it will doubtless have wide popular appeal. Moreover, at the present time, when the popular mind is becoming ever more willing to consider new ideas, the claims renewed by Mr. Tompkins that the

Great Pyramid embodied various kinds of symbolism are likely to be taken more seriously than ever before.

Better Understanding

Mr. Tompkins offers a mass of evidence in support of the theories that it was an astronomical observatory, a basis for astrological predictions, and a monument to highly sophisticated mathematical and geodetic calculations. Whatever the truth of these interpretations, one fact emerges with undeniable clarity—that the Egyptians were a far older and more advanced people than Western culture has realized. This may open the way to the re-interpretation of other ancient monuments and writings.

Nevertheless, it is curious that, although Mr. Tompkins chose to quote H.P.B.'s statement that on this extraordinary astronomical knowledge was based "the everlasting record and the indestructible symbol" of the ancient Mysteries and Initiations, he makes no further use (aside from a brief description of those rites) of either her arguments or those of authorities contemporary with her whom she quotes in support of her statements. In view of the exhaustive treatment the subject received in *Isis Unveiled,* and especially *The Secret Doctrine,* this omission weakens his own presentation.

Jesus the Essene Teacher?

A review by Robert Kirsch in the Los Angeles *Times* (Jan. 6) of *Rabbi J.,* by Dr. Johannes Lehmann, again raises a question about the historical identification of Jesus as Christ. Says Mr. Kirsch of Dr. Lehmann's book:

> His answers to these questions are not new—merely unfamiliar. But his argument is fresh and vivid. Fresh from translating a modern German edition of the Bible, Dr. Lehmann believes Jesus preached the doctrines of the Essene sect at Qumran, that Paul was the real founder of Christianity, propagating doctrines that departed from those preached by the historical Jesus, and that the Christ from which Christianity takes its name "has nothing in common with the historical Rabbi J., not even his name."

No "Outside Savior"

Dr. Lehmann sees the transformation of Jesus into a larger-than-life figure as an attempt to change a historical personage into a universal savior of mankind. The intent of the book is to restore the historical likeness of Jesus through detailed analysis of current

archæological research such as the Dead Sea Scrolls. If, as H.P.B. stated in several places in her writings, Paul was an Initiate, it is questionable whether he can be held responsible for the transformation of a historical religious reformer into an external savior. But by the same token, the identification of Jesus by the church as the "savior," leading to belief in a salvation which depends upon a being outside man, certainly deserves to be questioned.

"The God Within"

Writing on "the mystery of Christos," H.P.B. said in her article, "The Esoteric Character of the Gospels":

> The first key that one has to use to unravel the dark secrets involved in the mystic name of Christ, is the key which unlocked the door to the ancient mysteries of the primitive Aryans, Sabeans and Egyptians. The Gnosis supplanted by the Christian scheme was universal. It was the echo of the primordial wisdom-religion which had once been the heirloom of the whole of mankind; and, therefore, one may truly say that, in its purely metaphysical aspect, the Spirit of Christ (the divine *logos*) was present in humanity from the beginning of it. The author of the Clementine Homilies is right; the mystery of Christos—now supposed to have been taught by Jesus of Nazareth—"was identical" with that which *from the first* had been communicated *"to those who were worthy,"* as quoted in another lecture. We may learn from the Gospel *according* to Luke, that the "worthy" were those who had been initiated into the mysteries of the Gnosis, and who were "accounted worthy" to attain that "resurrection from the dead" *in this life* . . . "those who knew that they could die no more, being equal to the angels as sons of God and sons of the Resurrection." In other words, they were the great adepts *of whatever religion;* and the words apply to all those who, without being Initiates, strive and succeed, through personal efforts to *live the life* and to attain the naturally ensuing spiritual illumination in blending their personality—(the "Son") with (the "Father,") their individual divine Spirit, *the God within* them. This "resurrection" can never be monopolized by the Christians, but is the spiritual birth-right of every human being endowed with soul and spirit, whatever his religion may be. Such individual is a *Christ-man.* On the other hand, those who choose to ignore the Christ (principle) within themselves, must die *unregenerate heathens*—baptism, sacraments, lip-prayers, and belief in dogmas notwithstanding.

In order to follow this explanation, the reader must bear in mind the real archaic meaning of the paronomasia involved in the two terms *Chréstos* and *Christos.* The former means certainly more than merely "a good," and "excellent man," while

the latter was never applied to any one living man, but to every Initiate at the moment of *his second birth and resurrection.* He who finds Christos within himself and recognizes the latter as his only "way," becomes a follower and an *Apostle of Christ,* though he may have never been baptised, nor even have met a "Christian," still less call himself one.

A Second Look at Free Schools

Jonathan Kozol, a staunch supporter of the free-school movement, offers some reflections on its shortcomings which seem to reach beyond the specific applications he is making (*Saturday Review,* March 4, "Free Schools, A Time for Candor"). For one thing, he believes that the spontaneity sought in these schools does not eliminate the necessity for having underlying principles or the need to make them clear. He says:

> The issue comes into focus in the choice of teachers and in the substance of curriculum. In an effort to avoid the standard brand of classroom tyranny that is identified so often with the domineering figure of the professional in the public system, innovative free-school teachers often make the grave mistake of reducing themselves to ethical and pedagogical neuters. The teacher too often takes the role of one who has *no* power.

Attitudes Teach, Too

The justification for this, of course, is that the teacher can thus avoid, or at least reduce, the hazards of indoctrinating the pupils when their lack of knowledge combines with their acceptance of the teacher to make them vulnerable to uncritical acceptance. But genuine impartiality, according to Mr. Kozol, is not to be gained by having no opinions, any more than by concealing them:

> A teacher "teaches" not only or even primarily by what he *says.* At least in part, he teaches by what he *is,* by what he *does,* by what he seems to *wish to be.* André Gide said, "Style is character." In the free school, life-style is at the heart of education. The teacher who talks of "redistribution of the wealth" yet dresses in expensive clothes among the poor and spends the Christmas holidays in San Juan gets across a certain message, with or without words, about his stake in some of the nice things privilege can offer. A black woman with a conspicuous Afro and a certain definite quality of suppressed intensity in her manner and voice gets across a whole world of feelings and biases concerning race and rage and revolution. A white woman who dresses in old sandals, blue work shirt, Mexican skirt, whose long hair is frequently uncombed, who wears love beads or a molded-steel medallion on her breast, who calls things "neat," "right

on," "downers," and "together" presents a living advertisement for a whole body of implied ideas, political tendencies, and ideological directions.

Need for Positive Convictions

By her behavior the teacher also inevitably conveys instruction in attitudes of which she may not be conscious:

> In certain respects, the things a teacher does not even *wish* to say may well provide a deeper and more abiding lesson than the content of the textbooks or the conscious message of the posters on the wall. When war is raging and when millions of people in our land are going through a private and communal hell, no teacher—no matter what he does or does not do—can fail to influence his pupils. The secret curriculum is in the teacher's own lived values and convictions, in the lineaments of his face, and in the biography of passion (or self-exile) that is written in his eyes. The young teacher who appears to children to be vague or indirect in the face of human pain, infant death, or malnutrition may not teach children anything at all about pain, death, or hunger, but he will be teaching a great deal about the capability of an acceptable adult to abdicate the consequences of his own perception and, as it were, to vacate his own soul. By denying his convictions during class discussion, he does not teach objectivity. He gives, at the very least, a precedent for nonconviction.

Excellence Is Not Domination

Mr. Kozol also believes that genuine conviction is naturally associated with excellence. He thinks it a grave mistake to equate the power generated by excellence with the will to dominate. While intellectual competence has often been used in schools to intimidate the imagination of the young, and the power conferred by technical knowledge has been corrupted in the service of political or mercenary interests, there is no justification for assuming that this *must* be so. On the contrary, the example of both excellence and personal conviction *without* self-interest is very much needed by the children. Mr. Kozol continues:

> I think it is time for us to face head on this problem of our own inherent fear of strength and effectiveness. We must be prepared to strive with all our hearts to be strong teachers, efficacious adults, unintimidated leaders, and straightforward provocators in the lives of children. . . .
>
> It would not hurt to have upon the walls or in the stairways of our little schools photographs not only of those who do not fear to die for their beliefs but also of those who do not fear to

> win. I think that the children of the black and poor ought to be able to know and believe, right from the first, that the struggle for liberation does not need to end with sickness in the mountains or with steel helmets in Chicago or with a T-group in Manhattan. It can also end with personal strength . . . and the deepest kind of moral and pragmatic power.

Qualities of Leadership

How may examples of excellence and personal conviction be re-established? One of Ivan Illich's arguments for "de-schooling society" is that the skills people desire to learn are possessed by many who are not officially certified as competent, but who are nevertheless able to teach them. When we become willing to recognize these qualities without a badge of official approval, we will find them in many places. Moreover, what Dr. Illich has to say about the quality of leadership suggests that excellence as an educational tool does not lie wholly in competence in a particular skill:

> Leadership also does not depend on being right. As Thomas Kuhn points out, in a period of constantly changing paradigms most of the very distinguished leaders are bound to be proven wrong by the test of hindsight. Intellectual leadership does depend on superior intellectual discipline and imagination, and the willingness to associate with others in their exercise. A learner, for example, may think that there is an analogy between the U.S. antislavery movement or the Cuban Revolution and what is happening in Harlem. The educator who is himself a historian can show him how to appreciate the flaws in such an analogy. He may retrace his own steps as a historian. He may invite the learner to participate in his own research. In both cases he will apprentice his pupil in a critical art—which is rare in school—and which money or other favors cannot buy.

Changing Excellences

Dr. Bruno Bettelheim discussed a similar issue in a recent lecture at El Camino College, dealing with the relationship between parents and children. He said that the reason there is no longer honor between parents and children is that parents do not personally fulfill the well-defined obligations that once were necessary to insure the survival of their children. Many of these functions have been altered and reduced or eliminated, by our technology, so that the excellence in their performance, once seen and appreciated by the young, is no longer in evidence.

By what then, is this example of excellence to be replaced? Perhaps it may now be found in the capacity of teachers and parents

to embody personal conviction not based on inherited codes of "right" behavior, but on the honest exercise of critical discrimination. Relationships conducted on this basis of mutual respect for the ability to learn would go a long way toward providing protection against the pitfalls of dogmatic teaching.

A Better Meaning for Euthanasia

According to the *Wall Street Journal* for Jan. 31 of this year, the Euthanasia Educational Foundation is concerned with death with dignity, without excessive and unnatural prolongation of life, and does not advocate the deliberate taking of life. This seems a far better meaning for the term than its use as a synonym for what used to be called "mercy killings." There is, the *Wall Street Journal* reports, growing support among the elderly for the conception of euthanasia for which this foundation stands. By derivation, the word means simply "good death"—*eu* from the Greek for "good," and *thanatos* for "death." The *Journal* reports:

> Ironically, the current interest in euthanasia is coexistent with the results of recent remarkable advances in the field of medical science. Life expectancy has doubled over the past hundred years. The discovery of sulfa drugs, vaccines and antibiotics have tempered the ravages of influenza, pneumonia and tuberculosis, which in 1900 were the leading causes of death. Today's hospitals are filled with patients who are slowly dying of long-term degenerative illnesses such as cancer and heart disease. As remarked by Dr. Joseph Fletchter, a theologian and professor of ethics at the University of Virginia's medical school, today's dying patients "die comatose and betubed and sedated and aerated and glucosed and *non compos mentis*."

Dying with Dignity

To prevent this eventuality, many people are signing "living wills" in which doctors are requested to allow their patients to die rather than to be kept alive by machines or heroic measures. These wills, distributed by the Euthanasia Educational Foundation headquartered in New York, state in part: "I do not fear death as much as I fear the indignity of deterioration, dependence and hopeless pain." The signers further request the right to die in dignity. Although it is recognized that these "wills" are not legally binding, it is felt that the burden of guilt will be removed from doctors and relatives who might feel compelled to prolong life even in cases where it is realized that it is hopeless.

What Is It Like to Die?

The *Ladies Home Journal* for February, 1972, reports on th researches of Dr. Karlis Osis, director of the American Society fo Psychical Research. After polling over 5,000 physicians, he be lieves that clues to the quality of the afterlife can be found in th *hallucinations* that are a part of the death-bed experience. Th *Journal* says that Dr. Osis learned that "many patients briefly re vived by doctors report beautiful impressions of magnificent colo —such as those reported under LSD." Some reproached their do tors for bringing them back. According to the *Journal* article, th use of drugs clouds the patient's ability to experience what is hap pening. "If the moment of death was clear and not affected by drug or disease," Dr. Osis says, "the patient was more likely to demon strate a sense of more or less ecstatic anticipation of the end." Man doctors and nurses reported that patients on their death bed have look of "great surprise, as if they have seen something very attrac tive." Here, perhaps, was some sort of anticipation of the devachani dream.

Changing Attitudes

Even more significant than the increasing interest in euthanasi or normal death may be a lessening fear of death itself, while the de cline of elaborate funerals in favor of simple ceremonies or crema tion is doubtless a sign that orthodox religion is losing its influ ence. It appears that as materialized doctrines of the soul and li after death decline, so also do the fears of leaving this life. Profe sional workers as well as laymen have noted that there are defini stages through which a dying person passes; these point to the con sideration of death as an experience, instead of a dread finality Perhaps one of the gains of the present period of upheaval will b that the soul will no longer be identified either with this world o the next, but be recognized as an enduring, independent entity.